

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED



Bell Atlantic Network Services, Inc.  
1320 N. Courthouse Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201

Tel: (703) 974-7699  
Fax: (703) 974-0259

Jennifer L. Hoh  
Legal Department

ORIGINAL

February 24, 1999

RECEIVED

FEB 24 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

BY MESSENGER

Magalie Roman Salas, Esq.  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
The Portals  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: GTE-Bell Atlantic Merger  
CC Docket No. 98-184

Dear Ms. Salas:

Please place the attached letter to Thomas Krattenmaker in the public record for the above-referenced proceeding.

For your convenience, an original and twelve copies of this filing are enclosed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you should have any questions please do not hesitate to call me at (703) 974-7699.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Jennifer L. Hoh'.

Jennifer L. Hoh

Enclosure

No. of Copies rec'd 0+12  
List AEODE

RECEIVED

February 24, 1999

FEB 24 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

BY HAND

Mr. Thomas Krattenmaker  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street  
8th Floor  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: GTE-Bell Atlantic Merger, CC Docket No. 98-184

Dear Mr. Krattenmaker:

The attached report addresses the long distance issues raised by the pending Bell Atlantic and GTE merger.

GTE and Bell Atlantic also request that the Commission include in its order approving the license transfers for the merger limited, interim relief to allow the merged company to retain GTE Internetworking's existing Internet backbone and related businesses, as further described in the attached report.

Sincerely,

Steven G. Bradbury (JH)  
Steven G. Bradbury  
Counsel for GTE

Michael E. Glover (JH)  
Michael E. Glover  
Counsel for Bell Atlantic

Encl.

cc: W. Rogerson  
D. Stockdale  
M. Carey  
M. Kende  
T. Troung

Report of Bell Atlantic and GTE  
On Long Distance Issues In Connection With Their Merger  
and  
Request For Limited Interim Relief

At the request of the Commission's staff, Bell Atlantic and GTE respectfully submit this report on the long distance issues raised by their pending merger.

Bell Atlantic continues to pursue vigorously long distance authority for all of its in-region states, and soon will file with the FCC to obtain the first-in-the-nation long distance approval for New York. Once this initial application is granted, applications for other states will follow promptly.

This process will not be completed, however, within the Commission's publicly announced time-frame for completing its review of the merger in June of this year. Consequently, the companies request that the Commission's order approving the license transfers for the merger also grant limited, interim relief as follows:

First, with respect to traditional voice long distance services that GTE provides to residential and business customers originating in any Bell Atlantic in-region states where the long distance approval process has not been completed by the time of closing, the companies request only that the FCC permit a reasonable transition period to allow existing customers to transfer to other carriers. This transition period will ensure that no customers experience a disruption in their long distance service as a result of the merger.

Second, with respect to the Internet backbone and related services provided by GTE Internetworking (formerly BBN), the companies request that the FCC grant limited, interim relief to retain Internetworking's existing businesses while the long distance approval process is completed. This limited relief is critical in order to provide consumers with the significant procompetitive benefits that the merger promises for the Internet and related advanced services.

This limited relief, in the form of approving the temporary establishment of a single LATA for Internetworking's existing businesses, is well within the FCC's express authority to approve LATAs "established or modified by a Bell operating company after [the] date of enactment" of the 1996 Act. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 153(25). It also is directly analogous to relief granted under the AT&T decree to allow new services that did not fit easily into the LATAs established for traditional voice services to be provided over larger (in some instances unlimited) geographic areas. The relief would take effect once Bell Atlantic obtains long distance authority covering at least one-quarter of its lines in its fourteen state region, would remain in effect for a period of no more than two years after closing (unless extended for good cause), and Internetworking would operate as a separate affiliate under the terms of section 272 of the Act. These conditions will ensure that the local market is (and remains) open and Bell Atlantic is well along the road to obtaining long distance authority regionwide.

1. The projected timing of long distance authority under section 271. Bell Atlantic continues to pursue vigorously long distance relief throughout its 14 state region, and is well on its way to obtaining long distance relief.

Bell Atlantic's FCC application for New York will be filed soon, most likely in early April. As shown by the exhibits included in attachment A, that application is unlike any filed previously and should be granted:

First, the local market in New York is unquestionably and irreversibly open to competition. The best evidence is the actions of competitors themselves. Competing local carriers already have extensive facilities in place, including over 145,000 fiber miles, and already are serving more than 700,000 lines dispersed throughout the state -- including approximately 400,000 served entirely over their own facilities, more than 250,000 served through resale, and approximately 50,000 served using loops and other network elements. In addition, competing carriers are exchanging 1.3 billion minutes of traffic a month over some 250,000 existing interconnection trunks, and have established more than 300 collocation sites in Bell Atlantic's switching centers.

Second, Bell Atlantic has fully implemented the competitive checklist, and is actually furnishing each of the 14 checklist items to one or more competitors. In addition, Bell Atlantic has industry standard interfaces to its operations support systems that are in place and operational, and Bell Atlantic already is handling as many as 2,000 orders per day. It also is in the final stages of an independent third-party test under the supervision of the New York PSC that will demonstrate its ability to handle many more.

Third, the New York PSC has exhaustively monitored Bell Atlantic's activities, and has conducted extensive hearings and amassed a voluminous record to verify compliance. Based upon the terms of its pre-filing commitments with the New York PSC, Bell Atlantic anticipates that both the PSC and the Department of Justice will support its application.

Once the New York application is granted, Bell Atlantic will build on its New York experience to file prompt applications for other states, most likely beginning with Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, with other states such as Maryland, New Jersey and Virginia to follow.

These applications too should be granted. While competitors have devoted a significant portion of their effort to the attractive New York market, the local markets in these other states also unquestionably are open to competition. The best evidence again is the actions of competitors themselves, who have invested heavily in competing facilities and are in the market and operational. As shown in attachment B, competitors regionwide have captured an estimated 1.5 million lines, including approximately 800,000 served entirely over their own facilities and more than 600,000 served through resale. In addition, competing carriers are exchanging over 3 billion minutes of traffic a

month over 600,000 existing interconnection trunks, and have established more than 1,000 collocation sites in Bell Atlantic's switching centers.

Nonetheless, while Bell Atlantic will continue to pursue vigorously long distance authority for all its states, it has become apparent that the section 271 approval process throughout the Bell Atlantic region will not be completed by the time the FCC plans to conclude its review of the merger in June. Consequently, the following sections outline in detail a proposal for addressing the long distance issues raised by the merger in any states where long distance authority has not yet been obtained.

2. The order approving the merger should allow a reasonable transition for voice customers. GTE currently provides traditional circuit-switched voice long distance service to customers in Bell Atlantic's in-region states. The majority of these long distance customers are located in GTE's local service areas in Pennsylvania and Virginia.<sup>1</sup> A smaller number are located either outside of GTE's local service area in these states or are spread across the remaining Bell Atlantic states, with most of this latter group in New York.

If the Commission grants the limited, interim relief requested for GTE Internetworking (which it should), the companies intend to close the merger once they satisfy the conditions for that relief to become effective and the necessary state regulatory approvals are in hand. Bell Atlantic expects to have long distance authority in one or more of the states where GTE has long distance customers by that time, but it will not have long distance authority in all of the states where GTE has customers. As a result, GTE will cease providing voice long distance services originating in any states where Bell Atlantic has not received long distance authority.

To ensure that no customer suffers a disruption of service, however, GTE will need a reasonable transition period to inform customers and to allow them to move to a new carrier of their choice. This transition is complicated by the fact that GTE will not know precisely which customers need to move until the interim relief becomes effective. To address this problem, the Commission's order approving the merger should establish a reasonable period of no more than 90 days to transition, where required, existing GTE long distance customers to new carriers following the closing.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to its long distance service, GTE also offers local service under extended area service arrangements in Pennsylvania and Virginia that cross LATA boundaries in a limited number of instances. In order to continue these existing arrangements following the merger, the companies also will need approval from the Commission and will file petitions requesting that authority separately.

<sup>2</sup> See Golden West Associates, L.P., 59 Rad. Reg. 2d (P&F) 125 (1985) (transfer granted subject to the condition that Tribune come into compliance with the Act's cable/broadcast cross-ownership restrictions within 18 months); WWOR-TV, Inc., 6 FCC Rcd 193 (1990) (transfer granted subject to the condition that applicants take steps within 90 days to ensure compliance with the alien ownership rules); Cablevision VI, Inc., 5 FCC Rcd 7166 (1990) (the

3. The order approving the merger should provide limited, interim relief for GTE Internetworking. The Internet backbone and other related businesses of GTE Internetworking present a materially different case, and one where limited, interim relief is warranted.

The core of Internetworking is its Internet backbone service, through which it provides dedicated and ubiquitous Internet service for large business and ISP customers by maintaining a full set of interconnection (or peering) relationships with every major Internet backbone provider. It also provides private network arrangements using IP or other packet-switched technologies that allow customers to connect to its backbone, and for use by customers such as America Online that do not want to transmit their data over the public Internet. In addition, Internetworking provides other closely related services, including Web Hosting, wholesale dial-up Internet service for business and ISP customers who want to offer their own end-users the ability to connect to the Internet, and dial-up Internet service for residential customers.

Internetworking currently is undertaking a major transition to transfer the provision of its Internet and related services away from circuits leased from its competitors (primarily from MCI WorldCom) and onto its own national backbone, known as the Global Network Infrastructure, or GNI. The GNI, which consists of a national OC-192 fiber backbone that links points of presence in more than 70 cities across the United States, will be used to provide each of Internetworking's major product offerings described above.

In its order approving the merger, the Commission should grant limited, interim relief to allow the merged company to retain Internetworking's existing Internet backbone and related businesses while the long distance approval process is completed. Granting this limited relief – rather than extending regulatory restrictions designed for traditional long distance services to the Internet backbone and related services provided by Internetworking – will produce significant public interest benefits and is well within the FCC's express statutory authority.

a. The requested relief will produce significant benefits. As explained in detail in previous filings, the merger of Bell Atlantic and GTE will produce enormous public interest benefits by preserving and enhancing Internetworking's ability to provide services on competitive terms. This result is critical to preserving competition in markets that are becoming increasingly concentrated.

---

FCC may "delay[] enforcement [of a statutory provision] temporarily to accommodate the exigencies of the marketplace").

For these public interest benefits to materialize, however, it is essential that the new company be able to operate Internetworking's existing Internet backbone and related businesses that feed traffic onto it without interruption. Indeed, without limited relief to keep Internetworking functioning as a national whole, the market for Internet backbone service will suffer serious competitive injury. As the Commission is well aware, the Internet is a global, interconnected "network of networks" that does not resemble traditional circuit-switched interexchange networks and does not conform (and can not reasonably be conformed) to the LATA structure.

The FCC and other regulators previously have recognized the need to protect against further concentration in the Internet backbone market. For that very reason, the Commission blocked the combination of MCI and WorldCom's backbone networks -- a combination that would have given two firms (MCI WorldCom and Sprint) control over the great majority of Internet traffic. The Commission based its actions on the need to "ensure that the dynamism that has characterized the Internet will not be undermined," and to guarantee that Internet services "remain competitive, accessible, and devoid of entry barriers." MCI WorldCom Order 13 FCC Rcd 18025, ¶ 142 (1998).

Despite these actions, the state of Internet backbone competition remains precarious. Cable & Wireless, MCI's successor, has had well-publicized problems retaining its customers and faces a serious risk of falling from the top tier.<sup>3</sup> AT&T, on the other hand, is moving rapidly to fill Cable & Wireless's place -- acquiring IBM's business-rich Internet backbone operations and consummating transactions with TCI, Time-Warner, and other cable operators that will give AT&T control over cable modem access for more than one-third of the nation's homes. As a result of these developments, GTE Internetworking, with a small 6 percent share of the backbone business, is the only remaining Internet backbone provider that stands in the way of the Big Three's acquisition of oligopoly control over the Internet.

There is no question that, if Internetworking is unable to continue operating its national backbone network without interruption, it will fall from the top tier of backbone providers. The pace of Internet traffic is growing at an astronomical rate -- doubling roughly every 6-8 months. Internetworking, therefore, must double the amount of traffic carried over its network over the same time period just to maintain its existing competitive position.

The reason that keeping pace is so important is straightforward. Today, major backbone providers exchange traffic through peering arrangements. These arrangements only work so long as the interconnecting backbones exchange roughly comparable traffic volumes and maintain mutual incentives to interconnect. If Internetworking were to fall significantly behind the other major backbone providers, those mutual incentives would break down and Internetworking would become dependent on the larger backbones,

---

<sup>3</sup> E.g., D. Pappalardo, "Ex-MCI Customers Hit by Cable & Wireless Blues," Network World (Jan. 11, 1999).

which could refuse to continue the existing peering arrangements and dictate unfavorable interconnection terms.

Yet, if Internetworking cannot provide Internet backbone service or the related services that feed the backbone in the Northeast, it will not be able to market ubiquitous Internet service to customers anywhere in the world. This will cause Internetworking to lose existing customers and stifle or severely hinder its ability to acquire new ones. The net effect will be to materially weaken Internetworking as a competitor of the Big Three, and almost inevitably cause it to fall out of the top tier of providers.

The public interest consequences of this lost competition would be severe. Because the value of each network backbone increases as the number of customers on the network increases, upsetting the delicate balance that exists today between major providers would tip the scales unalterably in favor of the Big Three. As their networks continue to grow relative to other providers, more and more customers will be pushed to those networks, creating a snowball effect that leads to still further concentration. The result will be a decline in competition for backbone services and ultimately higher prices for ISPs and other customers.

In contrast, granting the limited relief requested here -- relief that merely would allow the new company to operate Internetworking as it is operated now -- will help to preserve and promote the competitiveness of the Internet. By preserving Internetworking's access to major business customers in the concentrated Northeast market, this limited relief will give it a fighting chance to keep pace with the top tier of providers.

Moreover, by allowing Internetworking to draw on Bell Atlantic's existing marketing channels and established customer relationships, this relief will strengthen Internetworking as a competitor of the Big Three -- one of the key benefits of the merger as a whole. As explained in greater detail in previous filings, enhancing Internetworking's ability to attract new customers and to expand the volume of traffic traveling over its backbone network will allow it to reduce its unit costs by at least 10 percent and would make it possible to deploy points of presence in at least 11 new markets, which would expand the geographic coverage of the network by roughly 15 percent. The net effect will be to promote strongly Internet competition as a whole.

b. The requested relief is within the FCC's express statutory authority. The limited, interim relief requested here is well within the FCC's express statutory authority to approve the establishment or modification of LATA boundaries. It also is directly analogous to relief granted on multiple occasions under the AT&T consent decree by creating larger -- in some instances world-wide -- LATAs for services other than the traditional long distance services that were the focus of the restriction.

As an initial matter, the Internet backbone and related services at issue here are, at most, on the periphery of the long distance restriction. In fact, the advanced services at



issue here are completely separate from the plain old telephone services (POTS) that the LATA restrictions were originally designed to cover, and are based on new technologies that fundamentally differ from the old circuit switched network. As a result, they bear no resemblance to the core of traditional voice long distance services that Congress had in mind in enacting the restriction.

In fact, a number of the services provided by Internetworking require no relief at all. For example, the Web Hosting service it provides is clearly a permissible information service. The transmission services used in the provision of that information service (by connecting the Web Hosting facilities to the Internet) – presuming they constitute interLATA services at all<sup>4</sup> – are covered by the incidental relief provisions in the Act. 47 U.S.C. § 271(g). This is so both because they permit the storage in and retrieval of information from Internetworking’s Web Hosting facilities in distant LATAs, *see* § 271(g)(4), and because the delivery of information from these databases to customers is the very sort of “other programming services” that cable operators routinely offer to their own subscribers today, *see* §§ 271(g)(1), 522(14).

To the extent that the long distance restriction does extend to other aspects of Internetworking’s existing Internet backbone and related businesses, however, granting the limited relief requested here is well within the Commission’s express statutory authority to approve the establishment or modification of LATAs. 47 U.S.C. § 153(25)(B).

In fact, the practice of creating larger LATAs for advanced services was well established even prior to the 1996 Act. The court overseeing the AT&T consent decree, or “MFJ,” approved a number of modifications that permitted non-traditional services

---

<sup>4</sup> Under the express terms of the Act, the scope of the long distance restriction is established by the express definition of “interLATA services,” which means “telecommunications between a point located in a [LATA] and a point located outside such area.” 47 U.S.C. § 153(21) (emphasis added). And under the Act, “[t]he term ‘telecommunications’ means the transmission . . . of information of the user’s choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.” 47 U.S.C. § 153(43). In contrast, the Act defines information services as the mutually exclusive set of services that do involve a change in the form or content: “[t]he term ‘information service’ means the offering of a capability for generating, acquiring, storing, transforming, processing, retrieving, utilizing, or making available information via telecommunications, and includes electronic publishing.” 47 U.S.C. § 153(20). As these definitions make clear, and as the Commission itself has recognized: “[W]hen an entity offers transmission incorporating the ‘capability for generating, acquiring, storing, transforming, processing, retrieving, utilizing, or making available information,’ it does not offer telecommunications. Rather, it offers an ‘information service’ even though it uses telecommunications to do so.” Federal State Joint Board on Universal Service, Report to Congress, 13 FCC Rcd 11501, ¶ 39 (1998). Consequently, under the express definitions in the Act, the provider of an information service is not providing telecommunications, and cannot be providing an “interLATA service” that is subject to the restriction in section 271.

such as wireless and video to be provided over larger geographic areas.<sup>5</sup> These services were different from the POTS services that existed in 1983 when LATAs were created, and they did not fit comfortably into the LATA boundaries created with those services in mind.

Under the decree, for example, it was clear in the context of wireless (cellular and paging) services that the LATA boundaries for POTS hindered rather than promoted innovation and competition. As a result, the court initially established larger LATAs for cellular services, noting that mobile radio services did not fit easily into voice LATA boundaries, and rigid application of those boundaries to the BOCs cellular services would “substantially inconvenience[]” their customers.<sup>6</sup> The Court also acknowledged that imposing LATA boundaries on mobile services would entail a “substantial loss in the economic efficiencies which could be produced by integrated, multi LATA systems.” Later, the court established expanded cellular calling areas in numerous instances. For example, a call on the landline network from Washington to Baltimore was “interLATA,” but a call on the cellular network was not. Finally, in 1995, the court permitted BOCs to offer cellular service of any geographic scope under certain conditions,<sup>7</sup> and the 1996 Act removed even those conditions.

The court also established what effectively was a worldwide paging LATA in light of the differences between paging and landline voice technology. In February 1989, the court approved blanket relief permitting all BOCs to provide one-way paging services over any geographic range. The court noted that “in order to compete effectively in the paging market, paging services must be offered on an area-wide basis”; it also noted that paging services were in a “separate market” from traditional landline long distance services.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Modifications of LATA boundaries were granted under the MFJ for specified purposes, particularly to make possible the speedier development of new telecommunications services or increased competition. E.g., United States v. Western Elec. Co., 890 F.Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1995) (wireless services); United States v. Western Elec. Co., 1986-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) P67,148 (paging services); United States v. Western Elec. Co., 1986-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) P66,987 (D.D.C. 1986) (paging services); United States v. Western Elec. Co., 1987-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶67,452 (cellular services); United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Feb. 18, 1993) (cellular services); United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Sept. 20, 1994) (video and audio programming by satellite and other means); United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Sept. 21, 1993) (cable service); United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Oct. 24, 1994) (same); see also United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 1988); United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (Feb. 15, 1991); United States v. Western Elec. Co., 604 F. Supp. 256, 261 (D.D.C. 1984).

<sup>6</sup> United States v. Western Elec. Co., 578 F. Supp. 643, 648 (D.D.C. 1983).

<sup>7</sup> United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Apr. 28, 1995).

<sup>8</sup> Memorandum Order and Opinion, United States v. Western Elec. Co., at 4, No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Feb. 16, 1989).

Likewise, the court established what effectively was a national (and international) LATA for video and audio programming services. For example, the court permitted Bell Atlantic to “provide one-way television and radio services to the extent that the radio signal contours exceed [traditional voice] LATA boundaries.”<sup>9</sup>

As these examples illustrate, the decree court on a number of occasions granted relief to prevent the LATA boundaries that were established in 1983 for POTS from becoming a straitjacket for new technologies that would hinder innovation and impede competition.

The 1996 Act, in turn, expressly transfers the authority to establish or modify LATAs to the FCC. 47 U.S.C. § 153(25). While the Act could have frozen LATA boundaries for all times, or set strict limits on the Commission’s ability to approve the establishment or modification of LATAs, it did neither. Instead, the Act defines the LATAs that may be approved by the FCC only as “contiguous geographic area[s],” without any limitations on the geographic scale of those LATAs. By doing so, it preserved the flexibility that existed under the decree to adapt LATAs to changing technology.

The Commission has exercised its express statutory authority to establish or modify LATA boundaries on a number of occasions since the Act was passed, including at least one case where it modified the LATA boundaries that apply to advanced services.<sup>10</sup> Likewise, in its advanced services proceeding, the Commission has recognized that its statutory authority to approve the establishment or modification of LATA boundaries extends to other circumstances where exercising that authority will promote the development of advanced services.<sup>11</sup>

In prior cases involving the establishment or modification of LATAs, the Commission generally “weigh[ed] the need for the proposed modification against the potential harm from anticompetitive BOC activity, and consider[ed] whether the proposed modification will have a significant effect on the BOC’s incentive to open its

---

<sup>9</sup> Order, United States v. Western Elec. Co., No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. March 22, 1995).

<sup>10</sup> Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Petition for Limited Modification of LATA Boundaries to Provide ISDN at Hearne, Texas, Memorandum Opinion and Order, NSD No. NSD-LM-97-26, DA 98-923 (Com. Car. Bur.)(rel. May 18, 1998).

<sup>11</sup> E.g., Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, 13 Comm. Reg. (P&F) 1, ¶194 (1998) (“Advanced Services Order and NPRM”) (“We ... tentatively conclude that modification of [rural LATA] boundaries for the purpose of facilitating high-speed access to the Internet would further Congress’ goal of ensuring that advanced services are deployed to all Americans”).

local market pursuant to section 271.”<sup>12</sup> The limited relief requested here easily meets that standard.

First, strengthening the ability of Internetworking to compete with the Big Three is affirmatively procompetitive and is strongly in the public interest. At the same time, because the core of Internetworking’s existing services are separate from the public switched telephone network, and will be operated through a separate affiliate that complies with the requirements of section 272, the risk of anticompetitive conduct effectively is non-existent. Second, granting the narrow, interim relief will reinforce Bell Atlantic’s already strong incentive to obtain long distance authority under section 271. Indeed, the relief would only become effective once Bell Atlantic has succeeded in obtaining long distance authority for a significant portion of its lines, and by doing so has demonstrated that it is well along the way to obtaining long distance authority regionwide. Moreover, it would be temporary, limited to a period of two years following closing of the merger (unless extended by the Commission), providing still further incentive for Bell Atlantic to complete the section 271 process as quickly as possible. And, even with the limited relief needed to retain Internetworking’s existing Internet backbone and related businesses, Bell Atlantic still will have to complete the long distance application process in all of its states in order to enter the traditional long distance business.

The limited relief requested here does not in any sense require the Commission to forbear from applying the requirements of section 271 or any other provision of the Act. On the contrary, the Commission’s authority to approve the establishment or modification of LATAs is completely separate from any forbearance authority it has under other provisions of the Act. And, of course, Bell Atlantic still must comply with all of the requirements of section 271 in order to enter the traditional long distance market and provide service across LATA boundaries as they are defined by the Commission.

Likewise, the limited relief requested here would not automatically open the door to relief in other contexts. On the contrary, relief here is uniquely warranted by the need to preserve and strengthen the existing business of GTE Internetworking, and to keep it from falling out of the top tier of Internet backbone providers. And this relief would be tied to the Commission’s conclusion here, based on the voluminous record before it, that this particular merger will promote Internet competition and produce potentially enormous public interest benefits. These unique circumstances are unlikely to be replicated in other contexts.

c. The requested relief is consistent with prior FCC practice. Approving the license transfers subject to a requirement that the parties satisfy the conditions for interim relief before closing is consistent with previous FCC practice.

---

<sup>12</sup> Advanced Services Order and NPRM at ¶190.

In fact, the FCC routinely grants license transfers where some further (uncertain) event must occur or additional approvals must be obtained before the underlying transactions can be completed. For example, the FCC in the past has conditioned license transfers on a requirement: i) that the parties delay the transfers until they obtain relief from the long distance restrictions in the AT&T decree and until expiration of the statutory waiting period for antitrust review under Hart-Scott procedures;<sup>13</sup> ii) that the transfers at issue be approved by a bankruptcy court and be completed within nine months after that approval;<sup>14</sup> iii) that the transfers not be completed until the Commission acts on license renewal applications for stations involved in the transaction;<sup>15</sup> or iv) that an applicant complete its then pending unsolicited tender offer.<sup>16</sup> Most recently, the FCC approved AT&T's acquisition of TCI even though the parties still have innumerable other regulatory approvals to obtain at the state and local level.<sup>17</sup>

Likewise, the fact that some uncertain period of time would pass before the transaction could be completed has not been a barrier to Commission approval. On the contrary, the Commission has refused to revoke its approval even where the underlying transaction has not been completed several years after the original approval was granted. Here, in contrast, the parties fully expect that the conditions to obtain interim relief will be satisfied, and all other regulatory approvals will be obtained, at the latest by the end of the year -- a matter of months after the FCC plans to act on the license transfer applications.

4. Request for relief. Accordingly, Bell Atlantic and GTE respectfully request that, in its order approving the merger, the Commission also grant limited, interim relief to allow the merged company to retain GTE Internetworking's existing Internet backbone and related businesses, conditioned on Bell Atlantic's first obtaining long distance authority covering at least one-quarter of its lines. This relief would (1) consist of the establishment of a single LATA for GTE Internetworking's existing businesses, pursuant to the Commission's authority under 47 U.S.C. §153(25), (2) be subject to the requirement that Internetworking operate as a section 272 separate affiliate, and (3) extend for a period of two years following the closing of the merger, unless extended for good cause by the Commission.

---

<sup>13</sup> Tel-Optik, Ltd., 2 FCC Rcd 2276 (1987).

<sup>14</sup> MobileMedia Corp., FCC 99-15, WT Docket No. 97-115 (rel. Feb. 5, 1999).

<sup>15</sup> E.g., Columbia Montour Broadcasting, Inc., 13 FCC Rcd 13007 (1998); NewCity Communications, Inc., 12 FCC Rcd 3929 (1997); Illinois Valley Broadcasters, Inc., 11 FCC Rcd 13028 (1996).

<sup>16</sup> HLT Corp. and Hilton Hotels Corp., 10 CR 716, ¶ 31 (1997).

<sup>17</sup> Applications for Consent to the Transfer of Control of Licenses From Tele-Communications, Inc. To AT&T Corp., CS Docket No. 98-178, Memorandum Opinion and Order (rel. Feb. 18, 1999).

In addition, Bell Atlantic and GTE also respectfully request a reasonable transition period following the closing of the merger to allow traditional voice long distance customers to transfer to other carriers in those in-region states where Bell Atlantic has not obtained long distance authority as of closing.

## **ATTACHMENT A**


## **New York Is the First State Ready for Long-Distance Relief**

1. Bell Atlantic has fully implemented the 1996 Act's market-opening measures.
  - Bell Atlantic is actually providing each of the 14 checklist items to one or more competitors in New York.
  - Bell Atlantic has gone beyond the requirements of the Act in pre-filing commitments with the NYPSC.
  - Bell Atlantic has operations support systems in place handling up to 2000 orders per day, and extensive third-party testing of these systems is underway.
2. The NYPSC has extensively monitored Bell Atlantic's compliance.
  - The NYPSC was a pioneer in fostering local competition long before the 1996 Act.
  - The NYPSC has conducted extensive hearings and amassed a voluminous record to verify Bell Atlantic's compliance.
  - The NYPSC has overseen third-party testing of Bell Atlantic's operations support systems.
3. Competition is widespread and irreversible.
  - CLECs have made enormous investments and have deployed extensive facilities-based networks.
    - CLECs serve nearly 400,000 competitive facilities-based lines statewide.
    - CLEC fiber networks extend over 3000 miles (145,000 fiber miles) statewide. CLECs have established over 300 physical or virtual collocation nodes in New York wire centers.
    - CLECs nationwide have obtained \$20 billion in capital to invest in competitive networks; at least five of the ten largest CLECs have facilities-based networks in New York.




# Local Competition in New York

## Facilities Based and Resale Lines = 663,200




# Local Competition in New York


**CLEC Facilities-Based Lines**




**CLEC Resold Lines**




**Minutes of Use Exchanged**



**Growth in Loops  
(Unbundled and Platform)**



**CLEC Interconnection Trunks**



1996 Act  
271 Checklist

Competition and Bell Atlantic's Compliance Since the 1996 Act

1. Interconnection	⇒	Interconnecting carriers serving nearly 400,000 facilities-based lines; signed agreements with 49 facilities-based wireline carriers; 300 collocation nodes
2. Unbundled Network Elements	⇒	Bell Atlantic provides all 7 elements previously defined by the FCC and more. NYPSC has established UNE rates based on TELRIC methodology (Case 95-C-0657)
3. Poles, Ducts, Conduits, RoW	⇒	814,486 pole attachments; 678 conduit duct miles licensed (does not include Empire City Subway conduit access)
4. Local Loops	⇒	49,442 total loops, including 27,034 unbundled loops plus 22,408 loops provided as part of platforms
5. Transport	⇒	257,390 total trunks, including 47,328 trunks from CLECs to BA and 210,062 trunks from BA to CLECs
6. Switching	⇒	22,408 of both unbundled local and unbundled tandem switching ports, provided as part of platforms
7. 911/E911/DA/Operator Services	⇒	13 CLECs purchasing Directory Assistance via 38 DS1s; 8 CLECs purchasing Operator Services via 38 DS1s; 17 CLECs obtaining 524,848 E911 listings
8. White Pages	⇒	25 CLECs purchasing directory listings
9. Numbering Administration	⇒	721 NXX codes
10. Databases/Signaling	⇒	Millions of TCAP messages exchanged with CLECs
11. Number Portability	⇒	78,567 numbers ported (43,027 via LNP)
12. Dialing Parity	⇒	IntraLATA presubscription completed 1Q96
13. Reciprocal Compensation	⇒	1.3 billion minutes of traffic exchanged each month with CLECs
14. Resale	⇒	189,030 (Business); 59,097(Residential)

---

## **ATTACHMENT B**

# Competition Progress Report

---

	<u>Oct. '98</u>	<u>Nov. 1998</u>	<u>Dec. 1998</u>
◆ Agreements with competitors:	802	826	852
◆ Approved agreements with competitors:	566	610	641
◆ Unbundled loops:	64,000+	69,000+	74,000+
◆ Resold lines:	523,000+	568,000+	619,000+
◆ Collocation sites in our switching centers:	703	771	1,008

*\*Resold lines now reported from billing database rather than provisioning database. Decrease in October versus September caused by conversion*

(1305 additional  
under construction)

(1597 additional  
under construction)

(1662 additional  
under construction)



# Competition Progress Report

---

	<u>Oct. '98</u>	<u>Nov. '98</u>	<u>Dec. '98</u>
◆ Minutes of use exchanged between Bell Atlantic and our in-region competitors so far this year:	24.1+B	28.1+B	31.2+B
<i>-Final '97 Total: \$10.7B+</i>			
◆ Interconnection trunks in operation:	511,000+	550,400+	607,000+
◆ Exchange codes processed for use by our competitors:	4119	4119	4245
◆ Total estimated lines served by competitors:	~1,255,840	~1,400,000	~1,452,000

# December 1997 - December 1998


## Competition Progress Reports

---

	<u>12/97</u>	<u>12/98</u>
◆ Agreements with competitors:	393	852
◆ Approved agreements with competitors:	275	641
◆ Unbundled loops:	36,400+	74,000+
◆ Resold lines:	220,000+	619,000+
◆ Minutes of use exchanged between Bell Atlantic and our in-region competitors so far this year:	10.7 B+	31.2B+
◆ Interconnection trunks in operation:	231,500	607,000+
◆ Collocation sites in our switching centers:	404	1,008
◆ Exchange codes requested for use by our competitors:	2012	4245
◆ Total estimated lines served by competitors:	~720,000	~1,452,000

# 1998 Resale Services

**Total Bell Atlantic Residential/Business Lines  
(In Service)**






# 1998 Total Unbundled Loops


---

**Total Unbundled Loops (In Service)  
Bell Atlantic**




# Total Minutes of Use

Total Bell Atlantic Minutes of Use



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 24th day of February, 1999, copies of the foregoing "Report of Bell Atlantic and GTE On Long Distance Issues In Connection With Their Merger and Request For Limited Interim Relief" were sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, to the parties on the attached list.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jennifer L. Hoh", written over a horizontal line.

Jennifer L. Hoh

\* Via hand delivery.

ITS\*  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

Janice Myles\*  
Michael Kende\*  
To-Quyen Truong\*  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW, Room 544  
Washington, DC 20554

Chief  
International Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 M Street, NW  
Room 800  
Washington, DC 20554  
(2 copies)

Jeanine Poltronieri  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, NW  
Room 5002  
Washington, DC 20554

Chief  
Commercial Wireless Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
2100 M Street, NW  
Room 7023  
Washington, DC 20554

John Vitale  
Bear, Stearns & Co., Inc.  
245 Park Avenue  
New York, N.Y. 10167

CTC Communications Corp  
William L. Fishman  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington DC, 20007-5116

Cablevision Lightpath, Inc.  
Cherie R. Kiser  
William A Davis  
Mintz, Levin Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C  
701 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2608

Consumers Union and The Consumer  
Federation of America  
Gene Kimmelman  
Consumers Union  
1666 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20009

Corecomm LTD.  
Eric Branfman  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Communications Workers of America  
Debbie Goldman  
George Kohl  
501 Third St., NW  
Washington, DC 20001

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands  
Thomas K. Crowe  
Elizabeth Holowinski  
Law Offices of Thomas K. Crowe, P.C.  
2300 M Street, NW  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20037

Competitive Enterprise Institute  
James L. Gattuso  
Competitive Enterprise Institute  
1001 Connecticut Ave, NW, S. 1250  
Washington, DC 20036

Consumer Groups  
Patricia A. Stowell  
Public Advocate  
Division of the Public Advocate  
820 N. French St., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Competitive Telecommunications Association  
Robert J. AAmoth  
Melissa Smith  
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP  
1200 19<sup>th</sup>, NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Hyperion Telecommunications, Inc.  
Douglas G. Bonner  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

International Brotherhood of Electrical  
Workers  
J.J. Barry  
1125 Fifteenth Stree, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Dr. Mark Cooper  
Consumer Federation of America  
1424 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

e.spire Communications Inc.  
Brad E. Mutchelknaus  
Andrea Pruitt  
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

GST Telecom Inc.  
Barry Pineles  
GST Telecom Inc.  
4001 Main Street  
Vancouver, WA 98663

EMC Corp.  
Martin O'Riordan  
171 South Street  
Hookinton, MA 01748-9103

Focal Communications  
Russell M. Blau  
Robert V. Zener  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Freedom Ring Communications  
Morton J. Posner  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

National Small Business United  
Todd McCracken  
1156 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

USDA  
Christopher A. McLean, Deputy Admin.  
Rural Utilities Service  
Washington, DC 20250

Keep America Connected et. al  
Angela D. Ledford  
Keep America Connected  
P.O. Box 27911  
Washington, DC 20005

KMC Telecom Inc.  
Mary C. Albert  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission  
William McCarty  
302 West Washington Street Suite E306  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Level 3 Communications, Inc.  
Terence Ferguson  
3555 Farnam Street  
Omaha, NE 68131

MCI WORLDCOM, Inc.  
Lisa B. Smith  
R. Dale Dixon, Jr.  
MCI WORLDCOM, Inc.  
1801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006

David N. Porter  
Richard S. Whitt  
MCI WORLDCOM, Inc.  
112 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20036

National Consumers League  
Linda F. Golodner  
National Consumers League  
1701 K Street, NW Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006

Supra Telecommunications & Information  
Systems  
Mark E. Buechele  
Supra Telecom & Information Systems Inc.  
2620 S.W. 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Miami, FL 33133

PaeTaec Communications, Inc.  
Eric Branfman  
Eric Einhorn  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Pilgrim Telephone, Inc.  
Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, LLP  
Scott Blake Harris  
Jonathan B. Mirksy  
1200 Eighteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Public Utility Commission of Texas  
Pam Whittington  
1701 N. Congress Ave.  
P.O. Box 13326  
Austin, TX 78711-3326

RCN Telecom Services, Inc.  
Russell M. Blau  
Antony Richard Petrilla  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Sprint Communications Company, L.P.  
Philip L. Verneer  
Sue D. Blumenfeld  
Michael G. Jones  
Willkie, Farr & Gallagher  
Three Lafayette Centre  
1155 21<sup>st</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

State Communications, Inc.  
Harry M. Malone  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 3000  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

WorldPath Internet Services  
Eric J. Branfman  
Morton J. Posner  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-1156

Telecommunications Resellers Association  
Charles C. Hunter  
Catherine M. Hannan  
Hunter Communications Law Group  
1620 I Street, NW  
Suite 701  
Washington, DC 20006

New Jersey Coalition for Local  
Telephone Competition  
Walter Fields  
NJ-CLTC  
P.O. Box 8127  
Trenton, NJ 08650

Triton PCS, Inc.  
Leonard J. Kennedy  
David E. Mills  
Laura H. Phillips  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC  
1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036-6802

TRICOM USA, Inc.  
Judith D. O'Neill  
Nancy J. Eskenazi  
Thelen Reid & Priest, LLP  
701 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20004

United Cellular Corporation  
Alan Y. Naftalin  
Peter M. Connolly  
Koteen & Naftalin, LLP  
1150 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036

US Xchange, LLC  
Dana Frix  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW Suite 3000  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Occidental Petroleum Corp.  
Irvin W. Maloney  
Occidental Petroleum Corp.  
1640 Stonehedge Rd.  
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Alliance for Public Technology  
Donald Vial  
901 Fifteenth Street, NW Suite 230  
Washington, DC 20005

AT&T  
C. Frederick Beckner, III  
Sidley & Austin  
1722 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006